Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/575,456	UENO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Julie Anne Watko	2627
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>amended</u>		
(1) Attorney Andrew D. St.Clair, Reg. No. 58739.	(3)	
(2) Primary Examiner Julie Anne Watko, AU 2627.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 March 2010	Time: <u>~11AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 3, 17		
Claims discussed: 3, 17		
Prior art documents discussed: Kuwajima et al (US PAP No. 20040240116 A1)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A _j	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The Examiner reminded Applicant that a change in location of known parts does not result in patentability, absent unexpected results due to the claimed locations. The Examiner contacted Applicant to ask what "significant advantages over the prior art" are meant by Applicant on page 24 in the reply filed 12/14/2009.

As shown in Applicant's Fig. 5-6, in order to unload arm 8A from the device, the arm must go backwards and forward. See especially Figure 6. Compare this to the device of Kuwajima et al, which has ho overhang on the load side. The arm needs to move in only one direction to unload. The advantage of the back-then-forward movement is that the arm is more securely held by the device. The arm could accidentally come out of the device of Kuwajima et al by a shock in one direction.

The advantage of this configuration is shown in the disclosure, and the configuration is now clearly recited in the claims. Because the configuration has these significant advantages, Applicant asserted that this is more than a mere rearrangement of parts.

The operation of the device is discussed in detail on pages 41-55, and the goal is disclosed to hold the arm securely when an external force accidentally strikes the device.